

America's Fighting Strength.

In the table of the armed strength of various countries it is customary to put Russia first among the nations of the world, with an active army of 1,125,000 soldiers, a first reserve of 2,500,000 and a second reserve of 1,375,000, bringing up the total number of available soldiers on a war footing to about 5,100,000, as against 5,000,000 in Germany, 4,800,000 in France, 2,500,000 in Italy, 1,600,000 in Austria-Hungary, and 1,100,000 in Turkey. But a recognized authority among military men, the *France Militaire* of Paris, in a recent issue disputes the correctness of the popular belief that Russia can put in the field the largest army of the world in time of war and says: "The United States are not a great military power from the point of view of their effective foot forces in peace, but in time of war their permanent contingent would form the nucleus of the vastest army of the world."

Prior to the beginning of the Santiago campaign and the stirring events of a year ago at Manila, it was not usual to include the United States in any computations of available armed strength, the nations of Europe being compared only with each other in this regard. But, as the quotation from the French military journal shows, in all computations of available military strength the United States must now be reckoned as a factor, and a very little computation shows that the view of the French military paper is very nearly correct. In the first place, in all authentic estimates of the available fighting strength of European countries, "soldiers" of every grade are included in the general total, whereas the American total is made up only of the regulars in the permanent service of the United States and without any reference whatever to the National Guard, which corresponds to the first reserve and outnumbers the regulars in the proportion of ten to one. The number of able-bodied male residents in different countries is put at 20,000,000 in Russia, 12,000,000 in Germany, 10,000,000 in Austria, 9,000,000 in France, 8,500,000 in Great Britain, 7,500,000 in Italy and 4,000,000 in Spain.

By the Federal census of 1890 the number of residents of United States in the category of males between 18 and 44 years, both included, was 13,230,000. Since then the population of the United States has increased 20 per cent., according to the most reliable estimate. The Actuary of the Treasury estimated the population of the United States on June 1, 1897, as 72,807,000, and by next year's census there is very little doubt but that the total population will be shown to be 75,000,000, an increase of 12,000,000 over nine years ago, and the total number of Americans of military age will not fall short of 17,000,000.

In the United States the number of physically disqualified persons incapable of serving in the army is materially less than in Russia, and the administration business of that country, too, is conducted almost exclusively by civilians, whereas Russia is under practical military rule, thus taking from the number of those available for military service all who are in the employ of the Government. Moreover, while forty-four years is put generally as the maximum age for soldiers, the majority of commanders and many of the officers, as well as the rank and file, are above forty-four. Everything considered, it is probable that Uncle Sam could, on a pinch, put more troops in the field for a "finish fight" than any other country in the world.

Imitative Filipinos.

Of all the races peopling this mundane sphere not one has such an extraordinary spirit of imitation as that which inhabits the Philippine Islands. This race of people, of Malay origin,

which occupies all the archipelago of the Celebas Sea, lacks entirely the aesthetic taste necessary for the proper combination of colors, constructive ability, uniformity in architectural designs, and the good taste which is required for the culture and advancement of a people. They have no ideas of this kind of their own, and in all matters of taste do nothing more than what they see in races of the West.

Any one who has observed the Filipinos will have noticed that they have no ideas at all in regard to the proper combination of colors in their wearing apparel, as, in spite of their dusky complexions, they select in their clothing the colors which are least suitable to them. You will see Indian girls and half-breeds as brown as berries using in their dresses and scarfs such colors as blue, green, yellow, brown and black. A woman of dusky complexion with a dress of any of these colors presents an appearance that is hideous in the extreme. It is not uncommon to see dark-skinned Indian girls dressed in such bright greens that if they should encounter a carabao they are liable to be eaten by that festive animal on account of their similarity to a bunch of hay.

The reason why those people cut this ridiculous figure is that they see these bright colors on European women, and, without thinking of the effect which on account of their different complexion such hues are liable to produce, readily adopt them and consider themselves the most elegant of the elegant.

No sooner does a new fashion arrive from Paris, Vienna or Berlin in shoes, trousers, hats, shirts or neckwear, no matter how extravagant, the Indian and the half-breed immediately adopt them.

The American troops had been in Manila only a few days with their brown suits before the stores on the Escolta were besieged by natives and half-breeds buying all the brown cloth obtainable, wool, cotton or silk, and in a few days they were all arrayed in suits of the same color as those worn by the army of occupation. They noticed the hats of straw or felt with a blue polka dot band, and in a few days all the Indians and half-breeds were wearing the same kind of hats as the Americans.

I believe that the Americans will have but little trouble in introducing here their usages, customs and language, as to that end the spirit of imitation which predominates in the native race will be a powerful factor.—*Manila Freedom*.

The Dreyfus Case.

The *London Times* gives a very carefully written summary of the Dreyfus case the following excerpts from which will prove interesting:

"Though it was known that M. Ballot-Beaupre would conclude in favor of revision of the judgment against Dreyfus, no one apparently foresaw the precise line of argument he would adopt, or the very striking pronouncement upon the authorship of the *bordereau* which yesterday caused such a profound sensation in Court. Upon that document, according to his view, everything depends. From the strictly judicial standpoint, he declares that there is but one question under discussion—namely, "that of the *bordereau* considered from the point of view of the handwriting "and the water-marked tracing-paper." Dreyfus, says M. Ballot-Beaupre, was arrested because of the resemblance between his handwriting and that of the *bordereau*, and was condemned upon this resemblance, declared by three out of five experts to amount to identity. Therefore, in the view of this experienced magistrate, for the revisionists to be successful they must prove that the *bordereau* is not in the handwriting of Drey-

fus. If it was not he who wrote it, he can hardly be held by any one to be the traitor by whom the documents it enumerates were communicated to foreign Powers. The Court of Cession, says its Reporter, has not to consider the question of secret documents laid before the Court-martial. These are matters which would be pertinent were the question one of simply annulling the verdict. But M. Ballot-Beaupre had previously discussed this matter, coming to the conclusion that, since the *bordereau* is a fact, it is impossible to maintain that there is neither crime nor offence, and, consequently, that mere quashing of the verdict is inadmissible. Therefore, he reasons, the only question for the Court to decide is whether revision shall or shall not be ordered, and in dealing with that question it has to assume that everything in the original trial was done regularly and according to law. Thus the fundamental question comes to be—Is the *bordereau* in the handwriting of Dreyfus? It was by this answer to this question that M. Ballot-Beaupre startled the Court and the audience. "Gentlemen," he said, "after a profound study of the question, I for my part "have come to the conviction that the *bordereau* "was written not by Dreyfus, but by Esterhazy." In this country most people who have followed the windings of the long intrigue came to this conclusion long ago, yet even they may perhaps share the surprise of the Parisian audience at hearing their conclusion thus directly formulated by the Reporter of the Court of Cession. Following the lines of a procedure in many ways strange to us, M. Ballot-Beaupre has set aside much that in this country would be of cardinal importance, but, on the other hand, has gone a longer step beyond what an English Judge would have thought it necessary to decide."

"It will be observed that the Reporter entirely respects the *chose jugée*. He puts aside altogether every question concerning the manner in which the Court-martial arrived at its decisions. He does not enter, in giving his own conclusion, into any of the numerous questions raised by his elaborate *resumé* of the case presented by one side and the other. He takes the *bordereau* as the foundation of a judgment which he does not call in question, and inquires simply whether there is any new fact that destroys or shakes that foundation."

"It seems a somewhat narrow and technical way of dealing with a monstrous miscarriage of justice. Indeed it is almost comical to think that the upsetting of gigantic conspiracy which has agitated France for a couple of years turns upon such a piece of carelessness in the choice of paper as novelists have worn threadbare. But we cannot doubt that M. Ballot-Beaupre knows his law, and as little can we doubt that he has chosen the line of argument which will least divide the Court of Cession. It has been made abundantly clear that neither the proved irregularity of Dreyfus's conviction, nor the appalling revelations of the unscrupulous forgery and perjury by which the case against him has been bolstered up, would suffice to procure revision of his sentence in the absence of something that would force unwilling minds to set aside the technical objection to interfering with the *chose jugée*, however iniquitous that may be. M. Ballot-Beaupre has found a new fact, which he thinks must be admitted to be such by all but the most bigoted defenders of the conspiracy. He confines himself to that new fact, he sets aside everything debateable and contestable, he refuses to enter upon any of the arguments which appeal to the general sense of equity or which lash the prejudiced into fury, he humours the sentiment too common on the French Bench, that a supposed culprit cannot be given up until another is found to take his place, and he argues simply that the new fact, taken together with what is already known, proves that Esterhazy and not Dreyfus wrote the *bordereau*."